

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 8-13 and 15-22 are in the application.

Claims 8-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Brickman U.S. Patent No. 2,660,406*. Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over *Brickman* in view of *White*. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant submits that *Brickman* does not teach or disclose the sharp points to be located at the intersections of the mesh, neither in the description nor in the figures. In the present invention, the mesh is formed of a number of longitudinal wires and cross wires, and the "intersections" of said mesh are the points at which said wires are joined by electrowelding. Thereafter, the sharp points are joined by electrowelding to the intersections.

In *Brickman*, the "intersections" are the points at which longitudinal wires and cross wires are joined. At the beginning of the process of forming the barbed wire of *Brickman*, a number of intersections are created. However, during the process "some of the cross wires are cut on a bias (...) and bent to form a substantially V-shaped barb," as stated in column 1, line 52 to column 2, line 7 of *Brickman*. Therefore, that point is no longer an intersection between a longitudinal wire and a cross wire, since that specific cross wire does not exist anymore, i.e. the cross wire has been transformed into a number of barbs. At no point in

Therefore, the Applicant respectfully considers that claims 8-13 are not anticipated by *Brickman*.

Regarding claim 15, *Brickman* does not disclose a sclerophylllic mesh where one part of each point protrudes from one side of the mesh and the other part of each point protrudes from the opposite side of the mesh. In *Brickman*, each point protrudes only from one side of the mesh, either with a single

point or with a V-shaped barb. In no instance in *Brickman* does a single barb protrude from both opposite face sides of the mesh. Regarding FIG. 3 of *Brickman*, this is an end view of FIG. 2, which clearly shows each barb protruding in only a single direction. Therefore, claims 15-20 are patentable over *Brickman* as well.

White does not teach or suggest any of these features either. Furthermore, the barbs of *Brickman* could not possibly be formed from a different material as claimed in claims 21 and 22, because the barbs of *Brickman* are formed from the crosspieces of the mesh itself. Therefore, it would be impossible to combine *Brickman* with White as the Examiner is suggesting.

Accordingly Applicant submits that claims 8-13 and 15-22 are patentable over the cited art, taken either singly or in combination. Early allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
Juan Maria CRUZ-SAGREDO GARCIA

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.      Elizabeth C. Richter, Reg.No. 35,103  
1077 Northern Boulevard      Attorney for Applicant  
Roslyn, New York 11576  
(516) 365-9802

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP: Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on April 8, 2009.

Amy Klein  
Amy Klein